

## Problem 28

Peer 6 would first send peer 15 a message, saying “what will be peer 6’s predecessor and successor?” This message gets forwarded through the DHT until it reaches peer 5, who realizes that it will be 6’s predecessor and that its current successor, peer 8, will become 6’s successor. Next, peer 5 sends this predecessor and successor information back to 6. Peer 6 can now join the DHT by making peer 8 its successor and by notifying peer 5 that it should change its immediate successor to 6.

## Chapter 3

### Problem 2

Suppose the IP addresses of the hosts A, B, and C are a, b, c, respectively. (Note that a, b, c are distinct.)

To host A: Source port = 80, source IP address = b, dest port = 26145, dest IP address = a

To host C, left process: Source port = 80, source IP address = b, dest port = 7532, dest IP address = c

To host C, right process: Source port = 80, source IP address = b, dest port = 26145, dest IP address = c

### Problem 7

To best answer this question, consider why we needed sequence numbers in the first place. We saw that the sender needs sequence numbers so that the receiver can tell if a data packet is a duplicate of an already received data packet. In the case of ACKs, the sender does not need this info (i.e., a sequence number on an ACK) to tell detect a duplicate ACK. A duplicate ACK is obvious to the rdt3.0 receiver, since when it has received the original ACK it transitioned to the next state. The duplicate ACK is not the ACK that the sender needs and hence is ignored by the rdt3.0 sender.

### Problem 12

The protocol would still work, since a retransmission would be what would happen if the packet received with errors has actually been lost (and from the receiver standpoint, it never knows which of these events, if either, will occur).

To get at the more subtle issue behind this question, one has to allow for premature timeouts to occur. In this case, if each extra copy of the packet is ACKed and each received extra ACK causes another extra copy of the current packet to be sent, the number of times packet  $n$  is sent will increase without bound as  $n$  approaches infinity.

## Problem 14

In a NAK only protocol, the loss of packet  $x$  is only detected by the receiver when packet  $x+1$  is received. That is, the receiver receives  $x-1$  and then  $x+1$ , only when  $x+1$  is received does the receiver realize that  $x$  was missed. If there is a long delay between the transmission of  $x$  and the transmission of  $x+1$ , then it will be a long time until  $x$  can be recovered, under a NAK only protocol.

On the other hand, if data is being sent often, then recovery under a NAK-only scheme could happen quickly. Moreover, if errors are infrequent, then NAKs are only occasionally sent (when needed), and ACK are never sent – a significant reduction in feedback in the NAK-only case over the ACK-only case.

## Problem 22

- a) Here we have a window size of  $N=3$ . Suppose the receiver has received packet  $k-1$ , and has ACKed that and all other preceding packets. If all of these ACK's have been received by sender, then sender's window is  $[k, k+N-1]$ . Suppose next that none of the ACKs have been received at the sender. In this second case, the sender's window contains  $k-1$  and the  $N$  packets up to and including  $k-1$ . The sender's window is thus  $[k-N, k-1]$ . By these arguments, the sender's window is of size 3 and begins somewhere in the range  $[k-N, k]$ .
- b) If the receiver is waiting for packet  $k$ , then it has received (and ACKed) packet  $k-1$  and the  $N-1$  packets before that. If none of those  $N$  ACKs have been yet received by the sender, then ACK messages with values of  $[k-N, k-1]$  may still be propagating back. Because the sender has sent packets  $[k-N, k-1]$ , it must be the case that the sender has already received an ACK for  $k-N-1$ . Once the receiver has sent an ACK for  $k-N-1$  it will never send an ACK that is less than  $k-N-1$ . Thus the range of in-flight ACK values can range from  $k-N-1$  to  $k-1$ .